

DEVELOPING A TEACHING MODEL THROUGH STUDENTS-SELECTED TOPICS AND IMPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN TEACHING WRITING AT SMAN 13 BANDAR LAMPUNG

Anggi Try Pratidina, Bambang Setiyadi, Mahpul

University of Lampung, Anggitrypratidina@gmail.com

Abstract

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui perbedaan pencapaian menulis antara siswa yang diajar menggunakan students-selected topics dan students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback. Penelitian ini juga bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah ada hubungan antara sikap siswa terhadap menulis dan pencapaian menulis siswa. Subyek dari penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas 7 di SMAN 13 Bandar Lampung tahun ajaran 2019/2020. Penelitian ini dilakukan pada 34 siswa di kelas eksperimental dan 34 siswa di kelas kontrol. Dalam proses pengambilan data, peneliti memberikan tes menulis dan kuesioner sikap. Kemudian, data dianalisis secara kuantitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa students-selected topics dan implicit corrective feedback mempengaruhi pencapaian menulis siswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa t-value lebih tinggi daripada t-table ($5.845 > 1.996$) dengan tingkat signifikansi kurang dari 0.005 ($0.000 < 0.005$). Selain itu, semua aspek menulis meningkat secara signifikan setelah penerapan students-selected topics dan implicit corrective feedback. Language use menjadi aspek menulis yang memperoleh peningkatan yang paling tinggi dibandingkan dengan aspek menulis yang lain. Di samping itu, organization mendapatkan peningkatan terendah. Selanjutnya, tidak ada hubungan antara sikap siswa terhadap menulis dan pencapaian menulis siswa.

This study is aimed at finding the difference in writing achievement between students taught through original students-selected topics and those taught through students-selected topic and implicit corrective feedback. In addition, this study is also aimed to find out whether or not there is correlation between students' writing attitude and their writing achievement. The subjects of this research were the first grade students of SMAN 13 Bandar Lampung in the academic year 2019/2020. The research was conducted to 34 students in experimental class and 34 students in control class. In collecting the data, the researcher administered writing tests and attitude questionnaire. Then, the data were analyzed quantitatively. The results shows that students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback affected students' writing achievement. The result revealed that t-value was higher than t-table ($5.845 > 1.996$) with the significance level of less than 0.005 ($0.000 < 0.005$). Furthermore, all aspects of writing significantly improved after the implementation of students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback. Language use has the highest gain compared to other aspects of writing. On the other hand, organization has the smallest gain. Moreover, there is no correlation between students' writing attitude and students' writing achievement.

Keywords: *Students-selected topic, implicit corrective feedback, writing aspects, students' writing attitude.*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a skill required in many contexts, especially in academic field. For instance, writing is the most used skill in evaluating students' performance in almost all levels of education (Afrin, 2016). Furthermore, according to Abas and Aziz (2016), in academic field, students are required to do writing tasks such as assignment, reports, thesis, and dissertation. It means that writing is important skill to be mastered by EFL students, especially in Indonesia. However, the capability of Indonesian students in writing is still low. It is suggested by Abas and Aziz (2016), most students in Indonesia find it difficult to express their ideas in English. Moreover, Aryanika (2016) states that some students feel hard to write, because they not only have low vocabulary mastery but also have the low motivation in writing and seldom build their confidence in writing it. It can be assumed that Indonesian students' difficulties in writing are associated with the difficulty in expressing ideas, low vocabulary mastery, and low motivation in writing.

There are some factors affecting students' writing difficulty in Indonesia. It includes the differences of culture, structural, and grammatical terms between Indonesian language and English. Ariyanti (2016) states that it is quite difficult to master writing, especially for EFL students in Indonesia, since there are some differences between Indonesian language and English such as structural and grammatical terms and styles. Furthermore, another factor affecting students difficulty in writing is dealing with grammar and vocabulary. English Foreign Language (EFL) students have to use the correct English grammar and vocabulary, apply the writing skills they have learnt, and incorporate these knowledge with their previous experience on the topic given when writing.

Considering difficulties in writing such as expressing ideas and low motivation, students are motivated and able to develop their ideas to write when they are familiar with the topic. Sujannah and Cahyono (2017), state that when students are familiar with the topic and have sufficient background knowledge about the topic, they can organize and develop their ideas well. Students-selected topics also allow students to explore and express their ideas and thoughts freely. Thus, student-selected topics in writing are important to be conducted in order to motivate and allow students to develop their ideas and also increase their motivation in writing.

There have been several studies related to students-selected topics in writing conducted, in which, students-selected topics have positive effects in some areas. Those studies are, students-selected topics increase students' fluency (Cohen, 2013; Grogan and Lucas, 2013; Sponseller and Wilkins, 2015; Lubold, Forbes, and Stevenson, 2016; and Dickinson, 2017), students also generally perceived to be more motivated and couraged to write when they are granted the right to choose their own selected topic in their EFL writing classes (Bonyadi and Zeinalpur, 2014). However, it is also reported that some students are hard in selecting a topic and expressing their ideas in English due to insufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. Takinami (2018) argues that some students struggle to choose a topic and even those who have managed to decide on a topic find it difficult to express their ideas in English due to insufficient vocabulary and less grammatical knowledge. Furthermore, Grogan and Lucas (2013) state that students have difficulty to choose a topic and it ends up taking time. Furthermore, they also think that they do not have grammatical knowledge or vocabulary to express themselves with a fixed topic. It means

that the original process of student-selected topic is less effective because students still have difficulty in finding a topic and due to their insufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge which leads students to often make error. This matter deals with students' performance in writing.

Furthermore, considering the issue above, teacher should help students in finding a topic by providing some topics related to the material. It is in order to help students choose the topic easier based on the material. In this study, dealing with students' difficulty in writing especially in choosing topics, the researcher provides some topics based on the descriptive text to help students in choosing the topic. Moreover, some studies on students-selected topics also suggest that in improving quality of students writing, especially on vocabulary and grammatical knowledge, there should be a corrective feedback given to students towards their writing. Ariyanti (2016) states that the teacher should understand that writing includes the activities of practicing, having guidance, and also feedback from the teacher. Furthermore, Takinami (2018) states that other factors that influence students' writing performance also need to be investigated, for instance, feedback. The statement is supported by Grogan and Lucas (2013), corrective feedback is necessary for improving written fluency. Moreover, Burstein, Chodorow, and Leacock (2004) assure that the best way for learners to improve their writing is to write, receive feedback, revise depending on the feedback, and finally repeat the whole process as often as possible. Thus, this study intends to stimulate students to write through students-selected topics and receive feedback through corrective feedback to allow students revise and improve their writing.

Moreover, there are two kinds of corrective feedback, explicit and implicit

corrective feedback. According to Noroozizadeh (2009), explicit corrective feedback refers to the correct form being provided by the teacher for students and requires students to transcribe the correction into the revised version of the text. On the contrary, implicit corrective feedback refers to an indication on the part of the teacher that there is an error without providing the correct form for students. Moreover, many researchers argue that implicit feedback is more effective than explicit feedback. Elashri (2013) states that explicit feedback shows what is wrong and how it should be written, but it is clear that leaves no work for learners to do and no chance for them to think what the errors and the mistakes are. Rewriting teacher's correction is a passive action that does not teach students how to recognize or correct errors and mistakes on their own.

Moreover, implicit corrective feedback helps students to improve their problem-solving skills and critical thinking and also allow them to notice. According to Saiffedin and El-Sakka (2017), implicit corrective feedback increases students' engagement and attention to forms and improve their problem-solving skills. Furthermore, implicit corrective feedback is able to encourage students to look more critically at their own L2 performance and notice their language problems (Noroozizadeh, 2009).

Thus, this study intends to conduct students-selected topics with implicit corrective feedback to help students expressing their ideas in writing and also allow them to revise their writing and know their language problem. This study also intends to investigate whether or not there is correlation between students' writing attitude and students' writing achievement. Setyowati (2016) states that ideally, students should have positive attitude to writing as it can help them to achieve better writing achievement. By conducting this study, it is expected that

student-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback will solve students' difficulty in writing. It includes students' difficulty in expressing ideas and low vocabulary mastery which affects students' performance in writing. Students-selected topics are expected to help students in expressing their ideas in writing. Implicit corrective feedback is expected to improve the quality of students writing and also allow students to use their critical thinking in revising their writing.

METHOD

This study used quantitative approach. The design of this research was control group pre-test post-test design. The population of this research was the first grade students of SMAN 13 Bandar Lampung. The research took two classes in the school as the sample. They were X MIPA 3 and X MIPA 1. For the data collection instrument, students writing attitude questionnaire and writing test were administered. The students' scores were analyzed by using t-test of SPSS 21 program. The gained data were analyzed by independent group t-test and paired sample t-test. Furthermore, the correlation between students' writing attitude and their writing achievement were analyzed by using correlation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section elaborates the result of students' writing achievement of two classes, which included control and experimental classes. The results of both class could be seen on the following table.

Table 1. The Result of the Writing Aspects Improvement in the Control Class

		Paired Differences				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
				Lower	Upper	
Pair 1	Pretest Content – Posttest Content	1.0588	.6602	-.8285		.000
Pair 2	Pretest Organization – Posttest Organization	.4706	.4915	-.6421	-.2991	.000
Pair 3	Pretest Vocabulary – Posttest Vocabulary	.7059	.5657	-.9032	-.5085	.000
Pair 4	Pretest Language Use – Posttest Language Use	.3529	.3994	-.4923	-.2136	.000
Pair 5	Pretest Mechanics – Posttest Mechanics	.5735	.4788	-.7406	-.4065	.000

Table 1 shows that all the writing aspects significantly increased, including content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. It is proven by the sig. (2-tailed) value which is below 0.05. Furthermore, the table above shows each mean of the writing aspects. In this study, content has the biggest increase with 1.058, the second is vocabulary with 0.705, followed by mechanics with 0.573, organization with 0.470, and the last is language use with 0.573. In addition, all writing aspects increased after being taught by using students-selected topic and implicit corrective feedback. Content becomes the writing aspect which performed best and language use has the smallest gain among all the aspects. Moreover, the table below shows the level of significance for each aspect of writing in the experimental group. In the control group, there is a significant improvement in students' writing achievement because students received a treatment of students-selected topics. Students-selected topic helps students to express their idea, since they are familiar with the topic. The familiarity of the topics makes students express their ideas better because they have a prior knowledge of the topics. It is in line with a study conducted by Lubold, Forbes, and Steveson (2016) on students' fluency, they argue that the improvement in writing fluency was the result of the students' prior knowledge of the topic they have selected.

Table 2. The Result of the Writing Aspects Improvement in the Experimental Class

		Paired Differences				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
				Lower	Upper	
Pair 1	Pretest Content – Posttest Content	1.05882	.99060	-1.40446	-.71319	.000
Pair 2	Pretest Organization – Posttest Organization	1.01471	1.00367	-1.36490	-.66451	.000
Pair 3	Pretest Vocabulary – Posttest Vocabulary	1.07353	1.00100	-1.42280	-.72426	.000
Pair 4	Pretest Language – Posttest Language	2.60294	1.65502	-3.18040	2.02548	.000
Pair 5	Pretest Mechanics – Posttest Mechanics	1.79412	.59183	-2.00062	1.58762	.000

Table 2 shows that all the writing aspects in the experimental group significantly increased, including content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. It is shown from the sig. (2-tailed) which is below 0.05. From the table above, it shows each mean of writing aspect and the increase can be seen from the gain. In this study, language use has the biggest increase with 2.602, the second is mechanic with 1.794, followed by vocabulary with 1.073, content with 1.058, and the last is organization with 1.014. In addition, all writing aspects significantly increased after being taught by using students-selected topic and implicit corrective feedback. Language use became the writing aspect which performed best and organization has the smallest increase among all the aspects. Moreover, different from the control group, in the experimental group, language use became the writing aspect which performed best and organization has the smallest increase among all the aspects. According to Jacob, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, and Hughey (1981), language use deals with errors, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions. In this case, language use also dealing with grammar which affects students' writing performance. Students mostly mistyped, used incorrect pronouns, word order, and also articles. In pronouns, students sometimes still get confused with the use of she and he and also they still got

confused with use of article a. Most of them have the background knowledge but they forget and sometimes do not know how to use the words appropriately. So when they received implicit corrective feedback, it helped them to arouse their background knowledge. Implicit corrective feedback also allowed students to use their critical thinking to revise their writing. It is in line with the previous research of Noroozizadeh (2009), the result of her study shows that implicit corrective feedback shows a good performance in terms of identifying 8 error categories which are verb form, preposition, number agreement, conjunction, pronoun, noun, adjective, and adverb.

Moreover, the table below shows the comparison between gains in control and experimental class. By comparing writing aspects' gain in control and experimental class, the gain differences will be found.

Table 3. The Gain Result of Writing Aspects in Both Control and Experimental Class

Writing Aspects	Gain in the Control Group	Gain in the Experimental Group	Gain Differences
Content	1.058	1.058	0
Organization	0.471	1.015	0.544
Vocabulary	0.706	1.074	0.368
Language Use	0.353	2.603	2.250
Mechanics	0.574	1.794	1.220
Total	3.162	7.544	4.382

The table above, shows the gain of writing aspects in both control and experimental classes. Furthermore, by comparing the writing aspects gain of control and experimental class, language use has the biggest increase which is 2.250. It is followed by mechanics with 1.220, organization with 0.544, vocabulary with 0.368, However, there is no gain in the content area, because in both control and experimental class have the same gain which is 1.058. Furthermore, by using

independent t-test version 21, the comparison of writing aspects gain from both control and experimental group were analyzed. It is done to know the significance level of writing aspects gain between control and experimental class. The following table below shows the level of significance for the gain each aspect of writing between control and experimental class.

Table 4. The Result of Independent Group T-test

		t-test for Equality of Means					
		T-table	T-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
							Lower Upper
Postminuspre	Equal variances assumed	1.9966	-5.707	66	.000	-4.3824	-5.9154 -2.8493
	Equal variances not assumed	1.9966	-5.707	42.815	.000	-4.3824	-5.9311 -2.8336

Furthermore, derived from Table 4 the students' writing achievement shows a statistically significant difference between those taught through students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback and original students-selected topics. It is revealed from t-value which is higher than t-table with the significance level of less than 0.05 ($5.707 > 1.9966$) ($0.000 < 0.05$). As a result, the hypothesis is accepted, there was an improvement of students' writing performance after being taught through students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback. in the experimental group, the students are received a treatment of students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback. Based on the findings in this study, it shows that there is a statistically significance different between the students' writing achievement taught through original students-selected topics and students-selected topics with implicit corrective feedback. The researcher assumed that it is because in the implementation of students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback, the researcher provides some topics based on

descriptive text and also implicit corrective feedback. By providing some topics, it eased students to choose a topic without taking too much time. The topics given do not limit students' preference, because the topics are based on the descriptive text, including person, place, animal, and thing.

Furthermore, implicit corrective feedback given helped the students to revise and improve their writing by using their background knowledge. The codes given by the researcher make them easier to revise their writing because the researcher also gave the explanation of each code to the students. This finding is in line with Noroozizdeh (2009), she states that implicit corrective feedback encourage students to look more critically at their own L2 performance and notice their language problems. Another study conducted by Seiffedin (2017), the finding shows that implicit corrective feedback increases students' engagement and attention to form and improve their problem-solving skills.

Correlation between Students' Writing Attitude and Writing Achievement After being taught through Students-selected Topics and Implicit Corrective Feedback

After conducting the treatments and posttest in the experiment class by using students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback, the researcher distributed writing attitude questionnaire in order to find out students' attitude towards writing after the implementation of students-selected topics and implicit corrective feedback. The results of the correlation between students' writing attitude and their writing achievement were presented in the table as follows.

Table 5. The Result of the Correlation between Students' Writing Attitude and Their Writing Achievement After being Taught Through Students-selected Topics and Implicit Corrective Feedback

		Attitude	Students' Writing Score
Attitude	Pearson Correlation	1	,196
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,267
	N	34	34
Students' Writing Score	Pearson Correlation	,196	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,267	
	N	34	34

The table above reveals that the Pearson Correlation was 0.196, and the significant 2-tail was 0.267. These two score described the correlation between students' writing attitude and their writing achievement. Based on the table above, the sig-value was 0.267 which is bigger than 0.05. It indicates that there is no correlation between students' attitude in writing and their writing achievement. the results of this study is not in line with a previous study conducted on the structural relationship between students' writing attitude and students' writing achievement proposed by Graham, Berninger, and fan (2007). In their study, they found that students who were more positive about writing had higher writing achievement. Furthermore, they also state that students with a positive attitude towards writing may invest more effort when composing and choose to write when other options exist, whereas students with a negative attitude may choose to avoid writing whenever possible and invest little energy when they are required to write. It means that students' attitude might affect students' effort in writing. Students who have positive attitude towards writing tend to invest more effort in writing, however students who have negative towards writing tend to have low effort in

composing and choosing to write. However, investing more effort does not guarantee students to have good writing achievement and vice versa. Writing is a skill so it takes time for students to master it.

CONCLUSIONS

Implicit corrective feedback is useful to improve students' writing aspects especially in the area of language use. However, it does not work well in improving students' content. Implicit corrective feedback is good to be implemented in teaching writing. It also can be implemented in teaching other text genres, such as narrative and recount text. Furthermore, there is no correlation between students' writing attitude and their writing achievements. It is because attitude affects students' effort in writing, but it can't directly affect students' writing achievement. So, sometimes students have positive attitude and give big effort in writing but their writing achievements are low. Students' attitude might affect students' effort in writing. Students who have positive attitude towards writing tend to invest more effort in writing, however students who have negative towards writing tend to have low effort in composing and choosing to write. However, investing more effort does not guarantee students to have good writing achievement and vice versa. Writing is a skill and it is a habit. It takes time for students to make writing as their habit.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abas, I.H. and Aziz, N.H.A. (2016). Indonesian EFL students' perspective on writing process: A Pilot Study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, Vol. 7 No. 3; June 2016.
- [2] Afrin, S. (2016). Writing problems of non-English major

- undergraduate students in Bangladesh: An observation. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 104-115.
- [3] Ariyanti. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, Volume 16 (2), 2016.
- [4] Aryanika, S. (2016). The correlation between the students' writing motivation and the writing ability. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*: Vol 9 (1), 2016, 215-232.
- [5] Bonyadi, A. and Zeinalpur, S. (2014). Perceptions of students towards self-selected and teacher signed topics in EFL writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98, 385 – 391.
- [6] Burstein, J., Chodorow, M., and Leacock, C. (2004). Automated essay evaluation: the criterion online writing service. *AI Magazine*, 25(3), 27-36.
- [7] Cohen, J. (2013). The Impact of topic selection on writing fluency: Making a case for freedom. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol 18 No. 1-2, December 2013.
- [8] Dickinson, P. (2014). The effect of topic-selection control on EFL writing fluency. *Journal of Niigata University of International and Information Studies*, 17, 15-25.
- [9] Elashri, I. I. E. A. F. (2013). The impact of the direct teacher feedback strategy on the EFL secondary stage students' writing performance. *ERIC Online Submission*.
- [10] Graham, S., Berninger, V., & Fan, W. (2007). The structural relationship between writing attitude and writing achievement in first and third grade students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32(3), 516-536.
- [11] Grogan, M. and Lucas, M. (2013). Do participant-selected topics influence L2 writing fluency? A replication study. *桃山学院大学人間科学*, 44, 219-244.
- [12] Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition; A practical approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [13] Lubold, S.L., Forbes, S., and Stevenson, I. (2016). The effect of topic selection on writing fluency among Japanese high school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 5 No. 2, January 2016, pp. 231-241.
- [14] Noroozizadeh, S. (2009). Indirect feedback: A plausible suggestion for overcoming error occurrence in L2 writing. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 245-262, Winter 2009.
- [15] Seiffedin, A.H., and El-Sakka, M.F. (2017). The impact of direct- indirect corrective e-feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 166-175, March 2017.
- [16] Setyowati, L and Sukmawan, S. (2016). EFL Indonesian students' attitude toward writing in English. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Volume.7 Number. 4 December, 2016. Pp. 365- 378.

- [17] Sponseller, A. C. and Wilkins, M. (2015). Investigating the impact of topic selection control on writing fluency. *広島外国語教育研究*, 18, 141-152.
- [18] Sujannah, W.D. and Cahyono, B.Y. (2017). The effect of self-selected topic and checklist- based peer feedback on Indonesian EFL students' writing ability. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* Vol. 4, No. 2; 2017.
- [19] Takinami, W. (2018). *Influences of Topic Selection Methods on L2 Learners' Writing Fluency: Replication Study*. Education Center, Tottori University.